

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/614,273	07/07/2003	Harry R. Haury	83198-007	7733	
	29493 7590 10/31/2007 HUSCH & EPPENBERGER, LLC			EXAMINER	
190 CARONDELET PLAZA			HAMZA, FARUK		
SUITE 600 ST. LOUIS, MO 63105-3441		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			2155		
			·	•	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/31/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		N			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/614,273	HAURY, HARRY R.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
•	Faruk Hamza	2155			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stany reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNION R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a control of the c	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 July 2007</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)	<u> </u>				
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	•	•			
closed in accordance with the practice und	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the applicat	ion.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.				
Application Papers		5.			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	rection is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority docum					
2. Certified copies of the priority docum					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	•	received in this National Stage			
application from the International But					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not	received.			
Attachment(s)	4) T imamila	Summany (PTO 412)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	D 11 /	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		nformal Patent Application			

Paper No(s)/Mail Date ___ U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

6) Other: ____.

Response to Amendment

This action is responsive to the communication filed on July 27, 2007.
Claims 18,21 and 25 have been amended. In response to the amendment and telephonic discussion with attorney of record Mr. Dennis Donahue the examiner has withdrawn the recent non-responsive notice and restriction requirement.
Claims 1-35 are now pending.

Election/Restrictions

distinct species of the claimed invention: Species 1 (A method for peer-to-peer messaging between network resources includes communicating with a first process by writing a first text file in a first scratch space; P [0019]); Species 2 (A method for peer-to-peer messaging between network resources includes reading a text file received within a scratch space to find a digital signature within the text file; P [0020]); Species 3 (A method for peer-to-peer messaging between network resources includes reading a text file to find at least one portion of the text file and to find a digital signature within the portion; P [0021]); Species 4 (A method for peer-to-peer messaging between network resources includes obtaining, by a first arbiter, a first output of a first process, parsing information within the first output into a first set of text file; P [0022])

Related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed are not connected in at least one of design, operation, or effect (e.g., can be made by, or used in, a materially different process) and wherein at least one invention is

Application/Control Number: 10/614,273

Art Unit: 2155

patentable (novel and non-obvious) over the other (though they may each be unpatentable over the prior art). See MPEP § 802.01(II).

In the instant case, the Species 1, 2,3 and 4 are not connected in at least mode of operation, which is clearly evidenced by Paragraph [0019-0022].

The Examiner has determined that the additional attributes present in Species 2,3 and 4 would not be an obvious variation of attributes present in Species 1 to one of ordinary skills in the art. Therefore, Species 1 is patentably distinct from Species 2,3 and 4, though they may each are unpatentable over the prior art.

The Examiner has determined that the Species 1-4 differ in mode of operation from one another in ways that would not be obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made. Therefore, Species 1-4 are patentably distinct from one another, though they may each be unpatentable over the prior art.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim appears to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.

Application/Control Number: 10/614,273

Art Unit: 2155

An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

A telephone call was made to the applicant's representative (Mr. Dennis Donahue) on October 18th, 2007 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is given **ONE** (1) **MONTH**, **or THIRTY** (30) **DAYS** from the mailing date of this communication, whichever is longer, within which to respond to this election/restriction requirement in order to avoid abandonment (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of this time period may be granted under 37 CFR 1.136(a).

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faruk Hamza whose telephone number is 571-272-7969.
The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached at 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at

Faruk Hamza

Patent Examiner

Group Art Unite 2155

886-217-9197 (toll -free).

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER